THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1891 · FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY · 1941

ROUND TABLE

LIBRARY OF THE
WOMAN'S COLLEGE OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO, N. C.

A RADIO DISCUSSION OF

HEADING FOR THE WHITE HOUSE

RALEIGH STONE · T. V. SMITH · MAYNARD C. KRUEGER

335th BROADCAST IN COOPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY • 123

JULY 21, 1940

The University of Chicago

ROUND TABLE

Published weekly. 10 cents a copy; five copies, 25 cents; half-year subscription, 26 issues, one dollar. Published by the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Entered as second-class matter January 3, 1939, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

No. 123

NOTE

The supplementary information contained in the footnotes to the following text, developed by staff research, is not to be considered as representing the opinions of the ROUND TABLE *speakers. Following the transcript of the broadcast are questions which readers may wish to use for analysis and discussion. It is hoped that teachers and discussion leaders may find this additional service of the* ROUND TABLE *transcript helpful in their study of the subject discussed in the broadcast.*

HEADING FOR THE WHITE HOUSE*

A UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE BROADCAST

RALEIGH STONE, Associate Professor of Industrial Relations

T. V. SMITH, Professor of Philosophy; Congressman-at-Large from Illinois

MAYNARD C. KRUEGER, Assistant Professor of Economics

(ALL THREE ARE MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO)

* A radio discussion broadcast from the University of Chicago over the Red Network of the National Broadcasting Company, Sunday, July 21, 1940, at 1:30 P.M., Central Daylight Saving Time.

The ROUND TABLE, oldest educational program continuously on the air, is broadcast entirely without a script. Subjects are chosen because of their social, political, or economic significance. The program has no "ax to grind." In the selection of speakers, the effort is to provide a balanced discussion by participants who have special competence and knowledge. The opinion of each speaker is his own and in no way involves the responsibility of either the University of Chicago or the National Broadcasting Company.

HEADING FOR THE WHITE HOUSE

•

MR. KRUEGER: Within the last few weeks the Democrats have put a couple of extra Republicans in the Cabinet, the Republicans have nominated a Democrat for the Presidency, and now the Democrats have nominated an ex-Republican for the Vice-Presidency. Doesn't that leave you just a little bit dizzy?[1]

MR. SMITH: It makes me think that we are determined to demonstrate the unity of the great national parties in an emergency. I like in *this* discussion to have the Vice-Presidential nominee of the Socialist party presiding over the quarrel Stone and I may have.[2]

MR. STONE: Doesn't it also represent a rather serious departure in that the parties no longer represent any significant difference in platforms and programs, so that here we have, as far as that is concerned, nothing to choose between?

---

[1] *Republicans Frank Knox, 1936 Republican candidate for Vice-President, and Henry L. Stimson, former Republican Cabinet member, were named Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, respectively, just before the opening of the Republican convention in Philadelphia last month. Wendell Willkie, Republican Presidential candidate, was a Democrat prior to the 1936 election and is so listed in "Who's Who." Henry A. Wallace, though he campaigned for both Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt, was a registered Iowa Republican until a few years ago.*

[2] *Professor Krueger was nominated as the Socialist party candidate for Vice-President at that party's national convention in Washington in April, 1940.*

MR. KRUEGER: Of course, as a Socialist, I'd say that's been true for quite some time. A more significant departure, I think, has taken place within the last week. A major political party has for the first time renominated a candidate for a third term as President.[3]

MR. STONE: Do you think that will be an important factor in the election?

MR. KRUEGER: I don't know whether it will influence two or three per cent of the vote. I think a considerable number of people will think of it. I doubt if it is important enough to throw the election.

MR. SMITH: I'd like to say that I, as an American, like the fact that the parties are airing the things on which they agree—as they always have, and more this year than ever before—rather than the things on which they disagree, and I sincerely deplore the introduction of a tradition into a discussion of very important economic issues. Traditions ought to be about unimportant things, like

---

[3] *There have been other third-term aspirants. General U. S. Grant, elected President in 1868 and 1872, was a candidate for the Republican nomination in 1880, after a four-year intervening period during which Rutherford B. Hayes was President. In 1912 Theodore Roosevelt ran for President as the Progressive (or "Bull Moose") nominee, but, since his first term began in September, 1901, when he became President after the death of William McKinley, it was urged at the time that he had, in fact, been elected to only one term, that of 1905–9, and that, in addition, an intervening period (since President Taft took office in 1909) had nullified the usual objections. President Franklin D. Roosevelt is the first man to be nominated by any party for a third term, although several persons were candidates for the Presidency that many times. William Jennings Bryan was the Democratic nominee in 1896, 1900, and 1908; Grover Cleveland ran as the Democratic candidate in 1884, 1888, and 1892; Eugene V. Debbs was five times the candidate of the Socialist party for President (1900, 1904, 1908, 1912, and 1920) and Norman Thomas will this year be its candidate for the fourth consecutive time (1928, 1932, 1936, and 1940).*

whether you would nominate Roosevelt without a ballot or with one. It is important to insist on that tradition, but not a tradition about important matters.[4]

MR. KRUEGER: Do you find any objection to a third term on principle, Stone, aside from the fact that I suppose you are opposed to Roosevelt?

MR. STONE: Yes, I am! I am disappointed in Roosevelt, I should say. Whether you would call it opposed or not is another matter. I certainly am much disappointed in him, and I think the third term is a dangerous precedent to set.[5]

MR. KRUEGER: My position on that, of course, is a rather peculiar one. Never having found a President that I wanted to see elected for a second term, the third-term issue doesn't take on very much significance for me. I suppose we have all read the platforms of the Republican and Democratic parties. I, for one, find them very much alike. Would you agree with that, Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes, I agree that they are very much alike and that they ought to be very much alike, because the important thing

---

[4] *Senator Edward Burke, anti-New Deal Democrat, wired Wendell Willkie his support after President Roosevelt was renominated at the Chicago Democratic convention July 17. Several other Democrats have announced their refusal to support the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket and former Senator James Reed of Missouri is reported to be considering the revival of his Jeffersonian movement which opposed President Roosevelt's re-election in 1936. Whether the anti-third-term movement will become as formidable as was that against a second term four years ago, when John W. Davis (1924 Democratic candidate for President) and Alfred E. Smith (1928 candidate) "took a walk," remains to be seen.*

[5] *For a fuller consideration of the third-term question see the* ROUND TABLE *broadcast of April 21, 1940, on which General Hugh S. Johnson, Secretary of the Interior Harold S. Ickes, and Dean William H. Spencer discussed "A Third Term?"*

is to dramatize the unity of the American people and put before them what the Democrats and the Republicans agree upon. That is primarily what these platforms do.

MR. STONE: If you read the platforms and compare them line by line, verse by verse, article by article, they do appear to be very much the same. But I do think there is a very important difference. The Democratic platform—by implication, if not by words—has told us that they have achieved recovery. "Here we are! We are a grand success, and you can expect four years more of the same sort of thing."[6]

MR. KRUEGER: Isn't that about what you would expect the Democratic platform to say? And wouldn't you expect the Republican platform to say they haven't?

MR. STONE: That's right! I would expect that. Now wait! I want to bring up this point: Irrespective of whether the Republican platform states any significant difference in policy and program and objectives from the Democratic platform, the candidate for the Republican party is on record as representing a very different sort of objectives.

MR. SMITH: Talk about being on record! The real difference between the two platforms is that the Democratic achievement of eight years is the Democratic platform and most of the platform is given over to saying, "this is what we have done." And the Republican platform (you speak of the record of Mr. Willkie so far as his political life goes) is mere promises and not performance. The promise is: "We will do the same things, but do them, we hope, better."

MR. STONE: Oh no, Smith! That isn't the statement. Willkie has said in so many words: "We have utterly failed to achieve busi-

---

[6] *The Republican platform was adopted in Philadelphia on June 26, and may be read in most newspapers of June 27; the Democratic platform was adopted in Chicago on July 17, and is available in most newspapers of July 18.*

ness recovery. We need jobs for 12 million more people and we must at once set about getting them. We've got to add $30 billion to our national income to raise it from $70-odd billion to $100 billion. We can't achieve the other objectives that are necessary to reconstitute our social order without achieving that."

MR. SMITH: Willkie *promises* that, but has not *performed* the putting of several million people back to work and the raising of the national income a good many billions of dollars. Performance versus promise, once more.

MR. KRUEGER: I don't think I can let either of you get away with that kind of talk. After all, what the Roosevelt administration has been doing in the last six months is so widely different than what most of the New Deal was supposed to be like during the previous six years that even this business of running on your record is wearing pretty thin when you shift suddenly from one program to another.

On this matter of Willkie being on record, he isn't on record at all yet on very many things. He is still in the process of consulting a lot of people about what the Republican platform that he is actually going to support during the campaign is going to be like, because he isn't running on the platform adopted in Philadelphia—is he?

MR. STONE: No, he didn't write that platform. As nearly as I can tell, that was Alf Landon's platform. It sounds just exactly like Alf Landon.

MR. SMITH: Roosevelt wrote the platform—didn't he?—by putting a record before the American people that the platform makers of the Republican party had to agree or disagree with, and with which they agreed.

MR. STONE: It seems to me that what both parties did was this: They recognize that the situation ahead of them is very fluid. All sorts of forces and conditions of a very important character may change what they should do in the way of a sound program.

MR. KRUEGER: That means that if you want to find out what

the election is about the last place in the world to look is in the platforms of the Republican or Democratic parties, because, under the rules under which they operate, they use words in order to dodge getting themselves on record on anything specific rather than to lay out any program to follow during the next four years.[7]

MR. STONE: I think that is true with respect to the Republican platform. I don't think it is true with respect to the Democratic platform, because the Democratic platform stands on its record and tells us just what we can expect: nothing substantially better than we have had in at least the last three or four years.

MR. SMITH: But something at least that good, and we don't know what to expect if Mr. Wendell Willkie is elected. We will trust and hope!

MR. KRUEGER: Of course, I defend Willkie against the charges that all he offers is promises. After all, he hasn't been elected (I doubt very much if he will be); but the point is that a man who hasn't been elected can offer nothing but promises. Promises are exactly what you've got to deal in, and it's no disadvantage to a candidate that he deals in promises. My objection is that none of the promises are specific. I'd like to get at the differences between Roosevelt and Willkie and what they are going to do about the adding of $30 billion to the national income and the ten or twelve million extra jobs that have to be created. Is that in Willkie's mind personally? It doesn't seem to be in the platform.

MR. STONE: We must get to that, but I think before we do there is one other thing we ought to straighten out. What a man will do is reflected in part by what he has written and stated in speeches, but you have to get back into the character of the man.

---

[7] *For a comparison of these "words [used] in order to dodge getting themselves on record on anything specific" see page 25 for a summary of the salient points of the Republican, Democratic, and Socialist 1940 platform declarations.*

MR. KRUEGER: That is very difficult to do when he is surrounded by a corps of professional promoters, isn't it?

MR. STONE: That's right!

MR. SMITH: And when his only public experience has been as head of a great corporation—which is not at all like democratic government.

MR. STONE: No, but he has had a remarkable record of achievement. He has demonstrated that he has the capacity for organization and management, and he is a whiz of a salesman!

MR. SMITH: Where he can hire and fire, yes. But in running a democratic government, with farmers and laborers as well as businessmen, he has yet to demonstrate that he can be impartial.

MR. STONE: He had no capacity to hire and fire the directors of TVA,[8] but he talked $30 million out of them . . . .

MR. KRUEGER: That's right!

---

[8] *The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was set up by a Congressional act approved in May, 1933, and amended in 1935 and 1939, to develop the Tennessee River system in the interests of "navigation, flood control, and national defense," and to generate and sell electric power. The first TVA-built dam for this system was finished in March, 1936, at Norris, Tennessee, and several others (including Wheeler, Pickwick Landing, Guntersville, Chickamauga, Watts Bar, Hiwassee, and Kentucky dams) are either completed or under construction. Last summer, after the augmentation of the system by the purchase of the properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Company, a subsidiary of Commonwealth and Southern, TVA power was being used by some 320,000 customers and being distributed by 61 municipalities (including Nashville, Memphis, Knoxville, and Chattanooga), 28 cooperatives, and several TVA districts. The right of the TVA to sell power has been twice upheld by the Supreme Court—8 to 1 on February 17, 1936 (the "Ashwander case") and 6 to 2 on January 30, 1939 (the "18 Utilities suit").* *See illustration, page 10.*

MR. STONE: . . . . which means he is a pretty good talker.[9]

MR. SMITH: He's a good talker, but he also ran down his rates because TVA was there as a measuring stick to cause him to run the rates down.

MR. STONE: That was one of the reasons, *maybe!*

MR. SMITH: No doubt!

MR. STONE: Maybe it was one of the reasons, but in all the other territories served by his utility—territories having no relationship whatsoever to TVA . . . .

MR. SMITH: TVA is national in its influence, remember!

MR. STONE: . . . . he reduced rates and enormously increased the consumption of electricity, and thereby served not only his corporation but the public; and he demonstrated by doing so an identity between the interests of the public and the interests of business.

MR. KRUEGER: That's a very strong statement, Stone.

MR. SMITH: I'd say it is!

MR. KRUEGER: I doubt very much if you will find that the record shows any substantial identity between the interests of the directors or the president of a public utility chain that is privately owned and the interests of the public. But unless you can produce more specific distinctions between the Democratic and Republican platforms, and more specific distinctions between their candidates, I'm afraid we are going to have to turn to something much more substantial for a University of Chicago ROUND TABLE.

---

[9] *The properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Company were purchased by the government, 22 municipalities, and 11 cooperatives on August 15, 1939, for $78,600,000, a figure $23,600,000 more (according to Mr. Willkie's statement) than the government had first offered, but one still $7,500,000 short of Mr. Willkie's estimate of the property's value.*

POWER RATES AND CONSUMPTION

IN A SUBSIDIARY OF COMMONWEALTH AND SOUTHERN: TENNESSEE ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

MR. SMITH: Mr. Willkie is a miniature Roosevelt in color, there's no doubt about that. With reference to the platforms themselves, I quite agree with what Stone said a moment ago. They are meant really to maintain freedom of action in a rapidly changing world, and that is nothing against the platforms.

MR. STONE: Now let's get back to that statement about a "miniature Roosevelt."

MR. SMITH: All right! I mean he is colorful.

MR. STONE: On that score, T. V., I think you are speaking as a politician: one Democrat speaking for another.

MR. SMITH: It's genial.

MR. KRUEGER: Then let's hear the Republican answer.

MR. STONE: I'm not a Republican; I'm a mugwump. I just have some hope and faith that it is possible to save the democratic society in which I believe.

Now let's take up the character of these two persons. Point No. 1 that I would make is that they are wonderful Pied Pipers. By Pied Pipers, I mean they are wonderfully colorful characters.

MR. SMITH: You mean, both are against the rats and both are for the children.

MR. STONE: That's right! They are both against the rats and both are for the children, and they do both know how to play the most enticing tunes of wonderful things to come.

MR. KRUEGER: And if I wanted to be facetious, I'd suggest that they are probably both leading us over the cliff.

MR. SMITH: That's the Socialist speaking now.

MR. KRUEGER: Exactly, because I don't find in any of the remarks you have made about character, personality, and so on, anything that has to do at all with what is going to happen after the election. Let's get down to the question of what the program is going to be after the election is over. I think that is much more basic.

MR. STONE: Let's take up the issues that will determine the outcome of the election. I don't know, Smith, whether you agree with me or not that the issues that will determine the election are these: that one of the candidates for President must convince the great body of the electorate that he has a program that is for *them;* that will constitute a better life for them.

MR. KRUEGER: And you are agreed that both of them are going to try to do it by playing Pied Piper tunes?

MR. STONE: No, we are not agreed as to that. We are just saying they are colorful characters. Am I right, Smith?

MR. SMITH: They are good showmen, and that is necessary; but they are both very sincere men and will address themselves to the issues—that is what we are saying.

MR. STONE: We will agree that they are sincere men—there is no question about that. Now, in order to make good, they've got to convince the common man, however—the great body of the electorate: all of us—that they've got a program on national defense that makes sense.

MR. SMITH: Most of all on defense and performance.

MR. KRUEGER: I've heard that said here several times. Let's get down to something more specific. Everybody is good, everybody's sincere, everybody's honest! Grant that all the way round. Where do you go from there? After this election is over and all of the political piffle has gone into the wastebasket, what is the difference going to be between the program of the Republican administration and the program of the Democratic administration?

MR. SMITH: I don't think there is any difference in terms of the issue that Stone raises, defense. They are both in favor of adequate defense for America, and they are both against participation in foreign war, and that's that!

MR. STONE: But there is this matter, Smith, when we get down to cases. What people want to know about defense is this: Are we going to get the ships? Are we going to get the airplanes?

MR. SMITH: *Performance*, I say; not promises.

MR. STONE: Yes, performance, not promises. We want a definite bill of particulars on that. We need so many tanks; we need armored cars.

MR. SMITH: That is, unless these things are coming off the production line by November it is going to militate against the Democrats who are in charge of the program.

MR. STONE: Unless they can demonstrate we are going to get those things.

MR. SMITH: That's right!

MR. KRUEGER: I can't let Smith get away with that vague statement about how both parties are opposed to any kind of participation in foreign wars. That sounds very much like 1916 to me.[10] I don't think those kinds of phrases in a platform are to be taken very seriously. I want to watch the policy that is in operation, and I'd say that policy and the one that Mr. Willkie apparently supports on foreign relations and defense is one that is headed straight through maximum preparedness into war.

MR. STONE: I would agree with you so far as the program that President Roosevelt has been following is concerned. He is leading us directly, and as rapidly as possible, certainly, into a war.

MR. SMITH: You say so!

MR. KRUEGER: That is the point—isn't it, Stone?—on which

---

[10] *In 1916 the Republican platform stated: ". . . . we believe in and will enforce the protection of every American citizen in all the rights secured to him . . . . at home and abroad. We desire peace, the peace of justice and right, and believe in maintaining a straight and honest neutrality between the belligerents in the great war in Europe. The Republican party believes that a firm, consistent, and courageous foreign policy . . . . is the best way . . . . to preserve our peace and restore us to our rightful place among the nations."*

In the same year the Democratic platform read: ". . . . we commend to the American people the splendid diplomatic victories of our great President [Wilson], who has preserved the vital interests of our Government and its citizens and kept us out of war."

there is the least possible difference between the Republican and Democratic candidates in platform.

MR. STONE: We must not be inconsistent. We said that these words mean nothing so far as the platform is concerned.

MR. SMITH: Not nothing; they mean something, but both parties will retain freedom of action through their platforms for doing whatever seems wise.

MR. KRUEGER: Which means that no faith is to be placed in a platform declaration about keeping out of war. I see much more significance in this military development than I think either of you do. I see an economic system that is not able to expand the standards of living, and industries switching over and beginning the expansion of the only industries that can expand, and those are the armament industries. That is the path that Mussolini marked out, the path that Hitler followed, and the path that the United States is very likely to follow in the name of opposing fascism, unless there is a substantial protest against it.

MR. SMITH: That is what *you* think, but you must remember that you are speaking now as a member of a party that believes that both the Republican and the Democratic parties are headed for disaster, in general, because they want to attack basic issues.

MR. KRUEGER: I'd like to hear an answer to that, however, if anybody has an answer.

MR. SMITH: The simple answer is that we live in a world in which certain things are happening, and the American people are convinced that those things will have an influence upon us sooner or later, and are determined to be adequately prepared to defend America—the Americas, in fact.

MR. STONE: I think the answer to you, Krueger, is that you've got the cart before the horse. You can't work up a system of national defense—which I think every sensible man recognizes is

necessary under present conditions—unless you first reconstituted the economic order to make it possible to produce all of the equipment necessary for defense. We can't do it now.

MR. SMITH: Hitler did it while he was bankrupt, Stone.

MR. STONE: I know, but he did it by establishing a corporate state. There's where the *non sequitur* is in your argument.

MR. KRUEGER: That is the way it is going to be done in the United States, isn't it?

MR. SMITH: No!

MR. STONE: Wait a minute! We don't want that kind of a system, and if either of these candidates let the people feel that that is the only way it can be accomplished he will not be elected.

MR. KRUEGER: Your position, apparently, is that the United States under the New Deal—with a national income still far below 1929—can't afford the kind of a preparedness program that you think it ought to have. My position, I think, would be exactly contrary to that. That is, that the larger the national income we have, the less pressure there is going to be to spend a lot of money uselessly on stuff that isn't any good for defensive purposes anyhow. The lower the national income is, and the longer we fail to solve the basic problem of unemployment, the more likely we are to go in for a tremendous armament program which may yet reach half of the income of the United States as it did in Germany and in France.

MR. SMITH: It may, but to say that the American people can't afford a program to defend the institutions that they have built up and love is not talking sense to the American people; and to say that Roosevelt is more likely to misuse this than Willkie simply raises the question: Is a man who has demonstrated eight years of magnificent devotion to the democratic process more likely to misuse preparedness than a man whose total public experience has been in a corporation where he could direct things from the top?

MR. STONE: With the first part of your discussion, Smith, I am in entire agreement.

MR. KRUEGER: Let's catch him on this though, Stone: I don't want to appear to be lined up with the Republicans, but after this Democratic convention, which was run by direct wire from Washington, to talk about the democratic process or to talk about Willkie having been dictatorial in Commonwealth & Southern sounds to me a little bit specious.

MR. STONE: I think it sounds pretty thin.

MR. SMITH: Direct wires from where, though, when Willkie was nominated?

MR. STONE: Direct wires from the voting public.

MR. SMITH: Oh, yes! Direct wires, like at the time of the Securities and Exchange legislation! Direct wires from telephone names that were never signed by them, perhaps!

MR. STONE: You were accusing Krueger of being cynical. Now you are being cynical.

MR. SMITH: I am factual about that. I do not say, however, that these telegrams originated from the same source. That is an open question.

MR. STONE: I don't think it is even an open question.

MR. SMITH: You close it, but I'll keep it open.

MR. KRUEGER: At least they were spontaneous telegrams that were probably pretty well planned.[11]

MR. STONE: As the matter is reported, every possible effort was made by Willkie's managers to prevent those telegrams coming in.

---

[11] *The comparison was between telegrams that flooded Congress in 1938 during consideration of anti-holding-company legislation, and those received in large number by nearly all delegates to the Republican national convention urging the nomination of Mr. Willkie.*

MR. SMITH: That's really a minor point.

MR. STONE: Let the future disclose that. I want to take up one other point in contradiction to the position that the Socialists take on this—and your own particular position, Krueger, with respect to national defense. We, the American people, can do anything that we think is really worth while doing.

MR. SMITH: Including defense, on whatever budget or national income we have.

MR. STONE: Including defense, yes. That brings us to a question that I think is vitally important not only to this election but to what will happen after it. One of the things either of these candidates must do, whichever is elected, is to restore faith in democracy; to give to the electorate a new faith, a new creed, a new program, a new hope in democracy.

MR. KRUEGER: Those are terms that are so good I am surprised that more of them were not included in both the Republican and Democratic platforms, but what do they mean in terms of jobs and in terms of security for people?

MR. SMITH: "Democracy is more than a political system for the government of a people." (Don't think I am reading from the Republican platform.) "It is the expression of the people's faith in themselves as human beings. If this faith is permitted to die, human progress will die with it." That is not the Republican platform; that is the Democratic platform.

MR. STONE: That's right, Smith, and those are good words; but, unfortunately, I am terribly distressed about the record of the Democrats. What they have produced is a democracy of mendicants. Nearly half our population are living on grants-in-aid of one sort or another.

MR. SMITH: Collective bargaining for labor doesn't sound like mendicants. It has made free men of these.

MR. KRUEGER: Of course, it's true that a considerable portion of the American public is continuing to live by some kind of subsidy, or subventions from the federal government.

MR. STONE: And it's a terrible system!

MR. KRUEGER: That's right.

MR. SMITH: Business has always occupied the system. The only reason it has been spread to the farmers and laboring people is to equalize it.

MR. STONE: That may not be the only reason it has spread.

MR. SMITH: That's an adequate reason.

MR. STONE: All right! But it's bad wherever it is.

MR. SMITH: I'll agree that it's bad, but how are you going to get rid of it?

MR. KRUEGER: Everybody agrees here that it is a terrible system and we don't want a democracy of mendicants. Of course I don't think you want a soldiers' republic either, which is the direction in which we are headed. But what are we going to do about the basic economic problem of unemployment that has been with us so long that the people who graduate from universities these days don't even remember the days of prosperity? We are standing at a crossroads where we are either going to go down the militarization road to solve the unemployment problem or down the democratic, collectivization road to solve it. I don't find any light or any hope whatever on that subject in the programs of either the Republican or Democratic parties.

MR. STONE: One of the articles that Wendell Willkie has written was entitled "Five Minutes before Midnight." I agree with you that we've got to solve this problem of unemployment; solve it in the sense of putting people back to work, or we are sunk.

MR. SMITH: That ought to have been written in 1929 or 1930:

"Two Minutes until Midnight!" I agree, too, we've got to solve the problem of unemployment.

MR. KRUEGER: It *was* written in 1932, Smith.

MR. SMITH: Neither of the great political parties know what to do about this problem of unemployment in the sense of an overnight solution such as the Socialists speak of. If they did, they would have done it already.

MR. KRUEGER: Why don't you find out?

MR. SMITH: Why don't *you* find out! We can't find out from Socialist dogmas. That is all there is to offer except the good sense of Republicans and Democrats.

MR. KRUEGER: No, but you could find out from the Socialist platform—which I think would be a good thing for you to read and which is going to be circulated more than the Republican and Democratic platforms, which tend to disappear so you can't find them as soon as the campaign gets under way.

MR. SMITH: That is all that will be circulated, so we ought to read it.

MR. KRUEGER: But I'd like to press that point of recovery. For a little more than ten years we have had an unemployment problem. Unless that unemployment problem is solved—and solved before another ten years go by—the United States washes over the cliff—led by Pied Pipers, or otherwise—into both fascism and war.

MR. STONE: I would like to quote your candidate Willkie on this subject, because I happen to agree with him.

MR. SMITH: Then let me quote Roosevelt's performance.

MR. STONE: All right! I am not a Republican any more than Willkie is. I voted the Democratic ticket just about as late as he did and I changed my politics just at about the same date that the candidate for Vice-President, Wallace, did. So, here we are, a bunch of

"mugwumps," which, as Smith says, is a very fortunate thing, perhaps, in the kind of circumstances we are in. But take a look at this matter of unemployment. There isn't any one simple formula to solve it.

MR. SMITH: Of course not! Not even the Socialist dogma can do anything about it.

MR. STONE: No, the Socialist dogma won't do anything about it, but we can think about a few other things. One is the attitude of government toward business. The great bulk of American businessmen think they are being unduly sniped at and they don't feel any confidence in investing money with the hope of getting it back.

MR. SMITH: Perhaps that will be all right with Willkie, a big corporation executive. What about the farmers and laborers?

MR. KRUEGER: These businessmen, these investors, have so little confidence in a government which occasionally calls them names that they rush to oversubscribe every government bond issue that comes out.

MR. STONE: That has nothing to do with it. As long as the government can continue to levy taxes, and as long as there is any income left at all to pay those taxes, government bonds are the best and safest security. That has nothing to do with enterprise.

MR. SMITH: Let's not harass Stone, because I think he is right. I mean, business has got to recover. Both parties say so.

MR. KRUEGER: That is still a very, very general phrase which we heard in 1932.

MR. STONE: The principal handicap to recovery, aside from the one I have mentioned, is found in the restrictive practices which the government has done more to build up than any other agency.

MR. KRUEGER: I disagree with you on that. I'd say that business itself, and of late both labor and the farmers, have gone in

for such a high degree of restrictionism that it is the curse of our contemporary setup.

MR. STONE: This is an absolutely unassailable doctrine, however, Krueger: that without government support for private special interests—groups of special interests—the same greed that leads people to organize monopolistic groups will also undermine them.

MR. SMITH: Don't forget Thurman Arnold's drive—the most magnificent and the most continuous and the most effective against monopoly of every sort, including labor union monopoly.[12]

MR. KRUEGER: A drive which would have to be continued at the present rate for another hundred years in order to come anywhere near to solving the monopoly problem in the United States.

MR. SMITH: You can't build Utopia overnight in the Socialist way.

MR. KRUEGER: You haven't got a hundred years to build it.

MR. STONE: Yes, Krueger, I agree with you on that. That is mostly words.

MR. KRUEGER: Apparently, we are not finding the distinctions in the platforms; and, apparently, we are not finding more than personality distinctions and a few character distinctions (that Stone is very much interested in) between candidates. The issues that will determine the election may not be the ones that will really characterize the difference between the programs that will be put in operation after the election is over.

MR. STONE: After the election is over, you would agree, and if Willkie is elected, there will be a very different attitude of government toward business.

MR. SMITH: I don't agree! I don't agree!

---

[12] *Thurman Arnold is in charge of the efforts of the Department of Justice to enforce the anti-monopoly laws; he has been active in the prosecution of both businessmen and labor leaders.*

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION

The answers to the following questions may be found in the text of the broadcast, and page references are provided to assist in locating the answers.

*

1. By what recent appointments and nominations has the gap between the two major parties said to have been bridged? Page 2.
2. Professor Krueger is a candidate for what office on what party ticket? Page 2.
3. What is suggested as the implication of the Democratic platform as far as economic recovery is concerned? Page 5.
4. The aims of Wendell Willkie as far as jobs and national income are concerned are stated to be what? Page 6.
5. Mr. Willkie's electric power operations came into conflict with what agency of the federal government? Page 8.
6. How do the major party platforms in 1940 stand on the question of American participation in the European war? Pages 13–14.
7. Summarize Professor Krueger's position on defense. Summarize and contrast to Professor Krueger's position those taken by Professors Smith and Stone. Pages 14–15.
8. Explain what is meant by the phrase "democracy of mendicants." Page 18.
9. What is "Thurman Arnold's drive"? Page 21.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The following questions of wider scope, intended for discussion, are suggested by the broadcast, and answers may be found in the literature on the subject listed in the section "Suggested Readings," found on page 24.

*

1. What appear to be the most important issues of the campaign? How would you summarize the way the party platforms and the party candidates treat these issues?

2. Study the party platforms and summarize how they agree and how they differ in such public questions as the following: Defense; Labor; Social Security; Unemployment; Business; Agriculture; Foreign Policy.

3. Do you agree that the party platforms "are first and foremost efforts to secure votes or to prevent their loss"? If so, how much reliance do you think the average citizen may place in a party platform as a guide to what a given party will do if elected? If he cannot judge future performance by platform statements, on what basis is he to determine what a candidate or party will do if placed in office?

4. "The larger the national income we have, the less pressure there is going to be to spend a lot of useless money . . . . on defense. The lower the national income is . . . . the more likely we are to go in for a tremendous armament program." Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Discuss.

5. Do you believe the third-term issue will affect the outcome of the coming campaign? Discuss.

6. For whom do you at present plan to vote in November? List the reasons that prompt your choice.

SUGGESTED READINGS

DeLong, Earl; Pearson, Drew; and Pollock, James K., *The Line-up for 1940.* A University of Chicago Round Table, Number 72, July 30, 1939. *Just a year ago this survey of 1940 possibilities pointed to President Roosevelt's renomination and set out the issues which (excepting the war) will dominate the coming campaign.*

DeVinney, Leland; Ise, John; and Jacoby, Neil H., *Economic Issues and 1940.* A University of Chicago Round Table, Number 103, March 3, 1940. *A consideration of the economic problems which will receive attention in this year's Presidential struggle—taxes, the budget, relief, jobs, wages, farm prices, national income, living costs, labor, and competition.*

Flynn, John T., *Country Squire in the White House.* New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1940. *A liberal looks at President Roosevelt's character, program, and accomplishments and suggests the New Deal hasn't gone far enough fast enough and that its present course of action is headed toward militarism and war.*

Guffey, Joseph F., "F. D. R. Must Run Again," *Current History,* July, 1940. *Pennsylvania's Democratic leader urges the renomination and re-election of President Roosevelt on his record and on the basis of the troubled international situation.*

Johnson, Hugh S.; Ickes, Harold S.; and Spencer, William H., *A Third Term?* A University of Chicago Round Table, Number 110, April 21, 1940. *The problem of a third term for President Roosevelt discussed.*

Willkie, Wendell, "We, the People," *Fortune,* April, 1940. *A statement of the views of the Republican candidate on the problems of American society in general and the American economic system in particular.*

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICIES

The Democratic Platform

Foreign Relations

"The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

"We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

"We favor and shall rigorously enforce the Monroe Doctrine. The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

National Defense

"Weakness and unpreparedness invite aggression. We must be so strong that no possible combination of powers would dare to attack us. We propose to provide America with an invincible air force, a navy strong enough to protect all our seacoasts and our national interests, and a fully equipped and mechanized army. We shall continue to coördinate these implements of defense with the necessary expansion of industrial productive capacity and with the training of appropriate personnel. Outstanding leaders of industry and labor have already been enlisted by the government to harness our mighty economic forces for national defense.

"Experience of other nations gives warning that total defense is necessary to repel attack, and that partial defense is no defense."

The Republican Platform

"The zero hour is here. America must prepare at once to defend our shores, our homes, our lives, and our most cherished ideals.

"To establish a first line of defense we must place in official positions men of faith who put America first and who are determined that her governmental and economic system be kept unimpaired.

"Our national defense must be so strong that no unfriendly power shall ever set foot on American soil. To assure this strength our national economy, the true basis of America's defense, must be free of unwarranted government interference.

"Only a strong and sufficiently prepared America can speak words of reassurance and hope to the liberty loving peoples of the world.

"The Republican party is firmly opposed to involving this nation in foreign war.

Americanism, Preparedness and Peace

"The Republican party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace. We accordingly fasten upon the New Deal full responsibility for our unpreparedness and for the consequent danger of involvement in war.

"We declare for the prompt, orderly, and realistic building of our national defense to the point at which we shall be able, not only to defend the United States, its possessions, and essential outposts from foreign attack, but also efficiently to uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine. To this task

the Republican party pledges itself when entrusted with national authority.

"In the meantime we shall support all necessary and proper defense measures proposed by the administration in its belated effort to make up for lost time; but we deplore explosive utterances by the President directed at other governments which serve to imperil our peace; and we condemn all executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the congress of the United States.

Aid to Preserve Liberties

"Our sympathies have been profoundly stirred by invasion of unoffending countries and by disaster to nations whose ideals most closely resemble our own. We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense.

"We believe that the spirit which should animate our entire defensive policy is determination to preserve, not our material interests merely, but those liberties which are the priceless heritage of America."

The Socialist Platform

"To furnish supplies for other peoples' wars is, to the profit seekers, a welcome alternative to supplying our own people with their daily bread. But the search for war profits and armament economics leads straight to war. War and frantic preparation for war mean the totalitarian state, not Socialist freedom.

"To the whole world let America say:

" 'We will not share in the collective suicide of your wars. We will, to the best of our ability, aid the victims of war and oppression. We will cooperate in disarmament and in all economic arrangements which will lessen the strain of insecurity and exploitation upon the peoples of all the world.' "

ROUND TABLE SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

Please send the University of Chicago Round Table for:

☐ One Year ($2.00) ☐ Six Months ($1.00)

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....

☐ I am enclosing the correct amount

☐ Please send me a bill

FOREIGN: ONE YEAR, $3.00; SIX MONTHS, $1.50

The Listeners' Round Table . . . .

Letters to the ROUND TABLE *frequently contain sidelights on the subject matter discussed on the air. These comments are from letters received following the broadcast July 14, "M-Day and America."*

*

Where, Why, and Who?

Your discussion this afternoon on M-Day was very interesting but did not answer the principal question asked, "Where are we going with this army, and what is the hurry?" The people are becoming very suspicious of this conscription act. It has been admitted that Hitler could not invade the U.S. What are we then preparing an army of 4,000,000 for? Who is the enemy?

L. W. D., New York

*

America, Yes

I appreciate this easy association in American minds of America with the rest of the world, but there seems to be comparatively little thought of America, and American problems, such as unemployment, industrial mobilization, and American military interests.

H. E. F., California

*

Manganese

One of your speakers stated that manganese—basic mineral used in making steel—was unattainable in the U.S. He is mistaken, as there is enough manganese in Polk County, Arkansas, alone to supply the U.S. forever. I know of one vein that is 70% pure that has a 40 ft. shaft sunk in solid manganese. . . . .*

G. L., Arkansas

*

The Postman . . . .

brought 407 other letters to the ROUND TABLE. Listeners attacked Hitler, the 5th column (4), the Versailles Treaty, England (2), Englishmen, WPA, and American education (2). Listeners praised German labor conditions, peace, the Bible, Dies, Jehovah's Witnesses, and the anti-5th-column action of the Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin. They advocated government control of all industry, redistribution of wealth, and truth, even if it hurts. One thought Americans talk too much, another that the ROUND TABLE is fascist. Two hope that America will not forget itself while worrying about Europe. Five plugged pet schemes for salvation. One criticized the ROUND TABLE, twenty-five praised it. The rest entered 133 subscriptions, brought 270 back issues, and 236 copies of the latest broadcast.

---

* *The United States produced 59,000 long tons of manganese in 1938, 25,000 tons of which was 35 per cent content or better. In the same year the United States imported 485,000 tons of manganese ore. Of metal used, 6.1 per cent was produced domestically.*—ED.

TRANSCRIPT SUBSCRIPTIONS

ONE YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION.....$2.00 SIX MONTHS'.....$1.00

FOR SINGLE COPIES OF THE BROADCASTS LISTED BELOW SEND TEN CENTS IN COIN TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. ANY FIVE PAST OR FUTURE BROADCASTS, 25 CENTS.

Nos.

1939

42. *The Economic Struggle for South America*
43. *America Arms—for What?*
44. *Is Security Increasing?*
45. *How Shall We Solve the Housing Problem?*
46. *Price Fixing*
50. *America's Neutrality Act*
51. *The Outlook for Europe*, Beneš, Wright, Schmitt
54. *The National Income*
55. *The Birth Rate and Business*
56. *Hitler's Economic Motives*
57. *"Room to Live!" Population Pressure and Aggression*
59. *Have We Helped the Farmer?*
60. *Refugees*
61. *If Europe Paid Its Debts*
63. *What Do You Mean—Americanism?*
64. *Russia and Europe*
65. *Freedom and the Economic System*
66. *The Place of Radio in a Democracy*
67. *Questions on Democracy*
68. *Our Liberties Today*
69. *Crisis in the Orient*
70. *Relief and the WPA*
71. *Out of School—Out of Jobs*
72. *The Line-up for 1940*
74. *Is the Consumer Getting His Nickel's Worth?*
76. *Europe on the Verge.* August 27
77. *War Comes.* September 3
78. *Will There Be a Blackout of Peace in America?* September 10
79. *The High Cost of Living*
81. *How Will We Get Recovery?*
82. *Prosperity vs. Boom*
83. *International Law—What Is It?*
84. *The Economic War*
85. *What's the War All About?*
86. *Testing Public Opinion*

Nos.

87. *After the Next Armistice—What?*
88. *Taxes*
89. *Propaganda*
90. *Russia Marches*
91. *Can Capitalism Survive the War?*
92. *Government and Business*
93. *When Tomorrow Comes*
94. *1939: Crisis Year*

1940

95. *Wages and Hours in the North and South*
96. *Is Our War News Accurate?*
97. *The Far East—Backdoor War?*
98. *The Jews*
99. *Economic War Between the States*
100. *Is Russia Losing in Finland?*
101. *Are Tariff Walls Blockading America?*
102. *War Myths*
103. *Economic Issue and 1940*
104. *Is America's Economic Frontier Closed?*
105. *Must the World Unite?*
106. *Can We Protect America?*
107. *The Census*
108. *The Archbishops Look at America*
109. *Scandinavia on the Spot*
110. *Third Term?*
111. *Where's that War Boom?*
112. *The Trojan Horse*
113. *Blitzkrieg, May, 1940*
114. *America and the Peacemongers*
115. *Babies Cost Money*
116. *If Germany Wins*
117. *Have We Time to Think?*
118. *Italy Marches*
119. *America's Capacity to Arm*
120. *Economic Union for the Americas*
121. *Civil Liberties and the Fifth Column*
122. *M-Day and America.* July 14

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE HAS WHAT IS PROBABLY THE LARGEST NETWORK OF ANY EDUCATIONAL BROADCAST. THE FOLLOWING STATIONS OF THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY CARRY THE PROGRAM EACH SUNDAY:

2:30 P.M. EASTERN DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

City	Call Letters	Kilocycles	City	Call Letters	Kilocycles
Boston, Mass.	WNAC	1230	Portland, Me.	WCSH	940
Buffalo, N.Y.	WBEN	900	Providence, R.I.	WJAR	890
New York, N.Y.	WEAF	660	Schenectady, N.Y.	WGY	790
Philadelphia, Pa.	KYW	1020	Wilmington, Del.	WDEL	1120
Pittsburgh, Pa.	WCAE	1220	Worcester, Mass.	WTAG	580

1:30 P.M. EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Asheville, N.C.	WISE	570	Lima, Ohio	WLOK	1210
Charleston, S.C.	WTMA	1210	Memphis, Tenn.	WMC	780
Charlotte, N.C.	WSOC	1210	Miami, Fla.	WIOD	610
Cleveland, Ohio	WTAM	1070	Norfolk, Va.	WTAR	780
Columbia, S.C.	WIS	560	Raleigh, N.C.	WPTF	680
Columbus, Ohio	WCOL	1210	Richmond, Va.	WMBG	1350
Detroit, Mich.	WWJ	920	Rochester, N.Y.	WHAM	1150
Florence, S.C.	WOLS	1200	Savannah, Ga.	WSAV	1310
Grand Rapids, Mich.	WOOD	1270	St. Petersburg, Fla.	WSUN	620
Greenville, S.C.	WFBC	1300	Tampa, Fla.	WFLA	620
Jacksonville, Fla.	WJAX	900	Washington, D.C.	WRC	950
Johnstown, Pa.	WJAC	1370	Zanesville, Ohio	WHIZ	1210
Lakeland, Fla.	WLAK	1310			

1:30 P.M. CENTRAL DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Chicago, Ill.	WMAQ	670			

12:30 P.M. CENTRAL STANDARD TIME

Amarillo, Tex.	KGNC	1410	Madison, Wis.	WIBA	1280
Birmingham, Ala.	WBRC	930	Milwaukee, Wis.	WTMJ	620
Bismarck, N.D.	KFYR	550	Minneapolis and		
Dallas, Texas	WFAA	800	St. Paul, Minn.	KSTP	1460
Des Moines, Ia.	WHO	1000	New Orleans, La.	WSMB	1320
Duluth, Minn., and			Oklahoma City, Okla.	WKY	900
Superior, Wis.	WEBC	1290	Omaha, Neb.	WOW	590
El Paso, Texas	KTSM	1310	Pittsburg, Kans.	KOAM	790
Evansville, Ind.	WGBF	630	St. Cloud, Minn.	KFAM	1420
Fargo, N.D.	WDAY	940	St. Louis, Mo.	KSD	550
Fort Wayne, Ind.	WGL	1370	San Antonio, Tex.	WOAI	1190
Indianapolis, Ind.	WIRE	1400	Shreveport, La.	KTBS	1450
Jackson, Miss.	WJDX	1270	Springfield, Mo.	KGBX	1230
Kansas City, Mo.	WDAF	610	Terre Haute, Ind.	WBOW	1310
Little Rock, Ark.	KARK	890	Tulsa, Okla.	KVOO	1140
Louisville, Ky.	WAVE	940	Wichita, Kans.	KANS	1210

11:30 A.M. MOUNTAIN STANDARD TIME

Albuquerque, N.M.	KOB	1180	Phoenix, Ariz.	KTAR	620
Billings, Mont.	KGHL	780	Salt Lake City, Utah	KDYL	1290
Boise, Ida.	KIDO	1350	Tucson, Ariz.	KVOA	1260
Butte, Mont.	KGIR	1340	Twin Falls, Ida.	KTFI	1240
Helena, Mont.	KPFA	1210			

10:30 A.M. PACIFIC STANDARD TIME

Bakersfield, Cal.	KERN	1370	San Diego, Cal.	KFSD	600
Fresno, Cal.	KMJ	580	San Francisco, Cal.	KPO	680
Los Angeles, Cal.	KFI	640	Seattle, Wash.	KOMO	920
Medford, Ore.	KMED	1410	Spokane, Wash.	KHQ	590
Portland, Ore.	KGW	620	Stockton, Cal.	KWG	1200
Sacramento, Cal.	KFBK	1490			

STATIONS CARRYING ROUND TABLE BY TRANSCRIPTION

Cincinnati, Ohio	WSAI	1330	10:15 P.M. EDST
Denver, Colo.	KOA	590	2:30 P.M. MST

THE ROVING REPORTER

discusses

SHOULD WE CONSCRIPT MEN NOW?

with

HUGH M. COLE, Instructor in History, University of Chicago

QUINCY WRIGHT, Professor of International Law, University of Chicago

•

A UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE BROADCAST

JULY 28, 1940

•

SUGGESTED READINGS

"In Advance of the Need," *Business Week,* June 15, 1940.

KIRCHWEY, FREDA, "A Democratic Program of Defense," *Nation,* June 15, 1940.

JOHNSON, E. C., "School Military Training Reconsidered," *School and Society,* March 2, 1940.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.